MYSORE VILLAGE PANCHAYATS AND LOCAL BOARDS BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider (contd.)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ 15 ನಿಮಿಷಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 15 ನಿಮಿಷ ಅವಧಿ ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಧಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ ಮಸೂದೆಯಾಗಿರುವದರಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳೂ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವು ಮತ್ತು ಮಹತ್ವದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಾಳೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಸಂಜೆಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗು ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಅದನ್ನು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ 15 ನಿಮಿಷ ಕಾಲ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕಲಾಗುವುದು.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—Sir, this is a very important Bill The other day, a resolution was discussed for three days. I, therefore, request the Chair, the Treasury Benches to see that at least four days are allotted for discussion of this Bill.

(Sri J. H. Shamsuddin rose to speak from the Treasury Bench).

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is the Hon'ble Member speaking on behalf of the Government? The conventions of this House must be followed.

(Sri Shamsuddin returned to his seat)

***Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN** (Honawar)—Sir, we are now at the fag end of this session. We are here for a longer period than was ordinarily expected. I know this is an important Bill, but as it is going to be referred to a Joint Select Committee, the House has to discuss only the principles involved in the Bill. The principles of the Bill have been discussed yesterday. The principle involved in this Bill is the abolition of District Boards. From the trend of discussion that took place yesterday it will be seen that there is unanimity of view that the panchayats should be re-vitalised by giving them more powers and allotting to them more functions. So, I do not think that the Bill should be discussed for four days. If that is done it will tire the patience of the members here and will not be in consonance with the importance of the Bill, particularly having regard to the fact that it will be thrashed out in the Select Committee. I, therefore, suggest that you may be pleased to restrict the discussion of this Bill to three days only.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ (ಕುಣಿಗಲ್).—ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವಹಾಗೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಎಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಇದೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗುವಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸದೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವೇಳೆಯ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾಲ್ಕುದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಐದು ದಿವಸ ಏಕೆ ಆಗಬಾರದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಭಾಷಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಪುನರುಕ್ತಿಯಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬಹುದು. ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಹತೋಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು 15 ನಿಮಿಷ ಅವಧಿಯ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಇರಲಿ. ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಕೊಡೋಣ. ಇನ್ನೂ ನಾಳೆ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯ. 15 ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಲಂಚ್ ಟೈಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್ (ಚಳ್ಳಕೆರೆ).—ಮೂರು ಆಕ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಅಭಿನಂದನೀಯವಾದುದು. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸಹ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಮೊದಲು ಸಭೆ

ಯಲ್ಲಿಯು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. 15 ನಿಮಿಷಕಾಲ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ನಂತರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಬಂದುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಸುದೈವ. 15 ನಿಮಿಷ ಅವಧಿಯು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಹಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದು. ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು restrict ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವದಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಆಗಿದೆ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಏನೇನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಹಾಗು decentralization ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು 15 ನಿಮಿಷಕ್ಕೆ ಟೈಮ್ ರಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—I rise to support for the first time my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik in regard to this matter. My friend Sri Shamsuddin who, perhaps inadvertently has come back to the treasury benches--said that after all the principle was accepted by the trend of talks. I may tell him that there are one or two matters on which even on the question of principle there are differences of opinion. He need not expect smooth sailing for the Bill. That apart, this Bill is likely to have a tremendous effect on the Local Self-Government administration. Sri Bheemappa Naik also said that after a lapse of ten years such a Bill has come up before the House and so sufficient time should be given for discussion. If the Chair had told us that each member would be given 15 minutes it would have been a different matter. But now in view of the importance of the Bill and the anxiety of the members of all shades of opinion to express their views, which are likely to be in the interests of the State, I would request the Chair not to restrict the time. If there is repetition from any one of us, the Chair has the privilege to cut short the time.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದರೊಳಗೇ ಕಾಲ ಮುಗಿಯಿತು. ನಾಳೆ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಮುಗಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. 15 ನಿಮಿಷ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ನಾಳಿದ್ದು ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲದೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಚರ್ಚೆಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಎಂಟೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಶಕ್ಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ 15 ರಿಂದ 20 ನಿಮಿಷಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು ಕಾಲನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಳೆಮುಗಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಳಿದ್ದಾದರೂ ಮುಗಿಸಲೇಬೇಕು. ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ.

***Sri H. V. KOUJALGI** (Sampagaon I).—Mr Speaker, I rise to support the Bill wholeheartedly and I congratulate the Minister in charge for having introduced this Bill, though late, in a consolidated form.

Before making my observations on this Bill, I want to point out the salient features of the Bill. Firstly, taking into consideration all the Panchayat Acts in force in various parts of the integrated areas, I may say that the present Panchayats have more powers so far as the development activities are concerned and it is a wholesome and good thing. In the present setup the panchayats do deserve more powers and they have been given such powers. In my opinion some more powers ought to be given to them and I shall refer to them later on Secondly, the constitution of Taluk Boards is a good sign Some years back, it was thought that the Taluk Boards were not necessary and were therefore abolished. So far as the Bombay area was concerned, they were abolished as long back as 1935 or 1936. We now find that development activities are going on in the villages and our attention is concentrated more in the improvement of the villages. In this context Taluk Boards have become a necessity and I welcome this improvement.

Thirdly, the present District Local Boards which are statutory bodies have been abolished and in their place District Development Councils have been

(SRI H. V. KOUJALGI)

introduced. That also, in my opinion, is a good improvement because when there are panchayats and Taluk Boards working, what is required is only a supervisory body to guide the two institutions. There should not be any statutory boards. When the District Local Boards were introduced during the British period, the aim was quite different. They were more or less a training ground for the people to gain administrative experience. After the attainment of independence when we have our own Government, and when and our object is to improve our own country, our own districts and taluks, I do not think that we require District Local Boards with statutory powers. The present Councils will suffice. At least in Bombay Karnatak we had District Development Boards which were more or less advisory bodies so far as development works and improvement of rural areas were concerned. The duties of the Development Boards and the District Local Boards were more or less common and were overlapping. It is therefore a good thing that these two bodies are abolished and in their places a single body, the District Development Council, is introduced.

2-30 P.M.

Now, Sir, coming to the Panchayat Act, I want to make a few observations.

Under the present Act, a village with a population of 15,000 and more will have a panchayat,—of course the Bombay Karnatak area has been excluded, because there, we have a panchayat in villages with a population of 1,000 or more. In my opinion, Sir, when the directive principle of the Constitution states that we should have as many panchayats as possible with all the necessary powers, I feel, that villages with a population of 1,000 or more should have panchayats. The stipulation of a population of 15,000 would be a retrograde step.

The second point which I want to say is, that no seats are reserved for ladies in the panchayats. In my opinion, some seats should be reserved for ladies since a majority of them are uneducated, and in the rural areas particularly they are rather shy and would find it difficult to come forward and contest elections. In such a situation, it would be better that some seats are reserved for ladies, in the Panchayats.

Now, Sir, the third point—I am not going into the details of the Act. I am speaking only on principles,—is that, there is provision in the Act for disqualification of members and candidates. Though such provisions exist they cannot be enforced into effect for some reason or the other. For example, if a man is bound over for bad character under the provisions of the Cr.P.C., the disqualification remains as long as he is bound over. Usually, it does not exceed two years. After that period, he can contest the election. Therefore the punishment of binding him over will have no effect. Secondly, if a man is convicted, he is disqualified for the period of imprisonment only. Even for an act involving moral turpitude the disqualification applies only for the period the sentence runs. In my humble opinion, such a person should at least be debarred from contesting the Panchayat election for a period of four or five years. He should lose at least one election as a punishment for the offence he has committed. Otherwise, this provision of disqualification will have no effect.

Next, Sir, if a man is disqualified for contesting election offences under the Panchayat Act, he is simply disqualified for that particular election and can contest the next election. Some period over which the disqualification will continue has to be fixed. I want to suggest another class of disqualification. A person who has been convicted for preparing illicit liquor should also be disqualified. Now-a-days society has changed and according to the new codes of conduct preparing illicit liquor is considered a heinous crime against society. Whether there is prohibition or not, illicit distillation is an offence. But drinking may not be an offence because people are sometimes allowed to drink on medical grounds. But a person, convicted for offences under the

Prohibition Act, should be disqualified from becoming a candidate, or a member or a voter.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—If he is convicted, he comes under that Act.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—A prohibition offence does not come under the definition of moral turpitude. If it is a case involving moral turpitude, then the disqualification comes under the Panchayat Act. So far as I understand, the legal position is that a person who prepares illicit liquor is not considered to have committed an act involving moral turpitude.

Fourthly, Sir, yesterday my friend Sri G. Sivappa pointed out that when a Member tenders any resignation, it is accepted after 15 days. In my humble opinion, such a resignation should be accepted immediately and no time to withdraw the resignation should be given. Otherwise, it will unnecessarily involve many other complications.

Sir, on the question of calling the first meeting, so far as I have read the provisions, the members of the panchayat are empowered to call for the first meeting and then hold the elections and if the Sarpanch fails, Government officers can hold such a meeting. Where party politics is involved, some members may play mischief by postponing elections and this time is unnecessarily wasted and legal complications result. I therefore feel that it would be better if the first meeting, should the sarpanch fail, is presided over by the Government officer. The responsibility for calling the meeting and presiding over it, should be that of the Government officers and not that of the members of the Committee.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—You want the Tahsildar to convene the Committee ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Either the Tahsildar or some officer appointed by him. Any gazetted officer could do it. Here even head clerk is a gazetted officer and he can preside over that meeting. The point is that if a member is entrusted with the task of calling the meeting, he never calls the meeting. Though the first meeting is called, he will not be present at the place. Then he calls the second meeting. This matter will have to be reported to the Revenue officers and he will take some time. Thus three or four months time is unnecessarily wasted in this process. In order to avoid all this, I suggest that the first meeting be called by a Government officer, be it a Tahsildar or an officer below his rank.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Should that officer issue the calendar ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—He should preside over the first meeting.

So far as the Panchayats are concerned, they have been given certain powers in connection with the development activities. They have the power to auction and to collect land revenue, if the Government entrusts them with that. That is a wholesome improvement.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—They are discretionary powers.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—I do not find any judicial powers being given to the panchayats. In my humble opinion, when it is the object of the Government that petty offences and petty quarrels should be settled by the village-elders, there should be sufficient powers to settle them, be they petty offences or even civil suits. But the question may arise as to whether all the panchayats should be given such powers. In my humble opinion, it is not necessary that all the panchayats should be given such powers. Only such of the panchayats which have done good work, and is recommended by the Collector or the Deputy Commissioner should be given such powers and it is not necessary that all the panchayats should be given such powers.

In this Panchayat Act, I find two more provisions which have been newly introduced.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—I should like to know what type of Panchayats should be entrusted with judiciary powers.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Petty offences. If it is an offence under section 323 or 500. . . .

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Offences under 323 are not petty. Can we entrust such things to municipalities ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—With due respect to my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik, such a thing is not unthinkable. It has worked well for nine years in respect of District Boards. I have personal experience. But this power should not be given to all the panchayats, but to only such panchayats as are recommended by the Collector. Where the members are good and where there are no party factions, this power should be entrusted.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Does the Hon'ble Member want that judicial powers should be entrusted to the panchayats or to a different body called the nyaya panchayats ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—The nyaya panchayat is a sub-committee of the p a n c h a y a t itself. The nyaya panchayat is something like a standing committee or a health committee. It is not different from the main panchayat. This power will be given to the members of the nyaya panchayat and not to all the members of the committee. This is just like a sub-committee of the panchayat.

As I was saying earlier, some new provisions have been introduced. A provision for moving no confidence has been introduced in the Panchayat Act. I wholeheartedly welcome this provision. Sometimes there will be no co-operation between the members and the Sarpanch. The Sarpanch will have lost the support of the majority. There will then be a deadlock. Many duties are entrusted to the Sarpanch, like bringing the money from the treasury, disbursement, etc. If 90 per cent of the members are on one side and ten per cent on the other side, the Sarpanch can create a deadlock. In such cases, it is better that this provision for no-confidence is there and the Sarpanch could be removed from office in the interest of smooth working of the panchayat. In many cases in the Bombay area, even the Collector or the Government could not do anything because there was no actual mis-appropriation on the part of the Sarpanch. It was only neglect of duty. The Sarpanch could therefore create a deadlock. I think that under such circumstances, the majority of the members should have a voice and the Sarpanch should be removed.

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Chitradurga).—Is not permission necessary to move a vote of no confidence against the Sarpanch ?

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Any member can do it.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Another wholesome suggestion is about putting interpellations and resolutions. Now-adays the practice of the panchayats is that the Secretary prepares the agenda according to the wishes of the Sarpanch and the members may or may not know the working of the panchayat. In such cases, at least they can put forth questions and move resolutions about matters concerning the improvement of the villages. This is an improvement on the old Act.

There are some other provisions of which I do not know whether they would be legal. There is a provision in the Bill provided for the asking of contribution from the Trustees and Mutts when special works are to be undertaken, and also for imposing a surcharge from an outsider, who is not a member. I doubt whether these provisions would be *intra vires*. I hope the Select Committee will look into it.

Then again, Sir, there is a provision in the Panchayat Act to levy a fee for supply of water from wells and tanks. This should not be there. It is the primary duty of the panchayat to supply d r i n k in g water. If the panchayats supply water through pipes, it is a different matter. But drawing water from a well or a tank, should not be taxed. Such a thing will not be in the interests of the villagers and supply of water is the primary duty of the panchayat.

Coming to the Taluka Boards, there are some peculiar circumstances so far as the Bombay area is concerned, which have not been taken into consideration. On our side there are Mahals and Pettahs. They are equal to a taluk. The revenue officer is called a Mahalkari. His duties are equal to that of a Tahsildar. Big areas are divided into two and the smaller area is called a Mahal or Pettah. The Act

has not made any provision concering these areas.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Something like a Hobli.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Hobli is within the jurisdiction of the tahsil But Mahal or Pettah is an independent tahsil by itself. It is a special taluk. It is a small taluk. It is an independent revenue unit. It would be better to include it in the functions of the taluk itself. It should now be decided whether there should be only one Taluk Board or there should be separate boards.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—What would be the population ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Forty to fifty thousand covering about forty villages. In old Bombay area these were included when the Taluka Boards were there in the taluk itself. For the taluka and mahal there was one Taluk Board. That arrangement can be continued.

Secondly, in the Taluka Boards, indirect elections has been introduced. In my opinion it will be better to have direct elections. Suppose there is a taluk which has 100 to 110 villages and a population of one lakh and twenty-five thousand, if you apply the principle of a population of 1,500, in a pettah only 20 to 25 villages get representation and the other 60 to 65 villages will remain unrepresented.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—All villages will be represented either by group panchayats or single panchayat.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—At present, you have panchayats with a population of 1,500.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—If there are panchayats with a population of 500 or 1,000 such panchayats will not constitute independent panchayats. Any panchayat with a population of 1,500 and above will be an independent panchayat.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—There will be no village which is not covered by village panchayat.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Then I am open to correction. If that is the case, the question does not arise.

The next point is about nomination, on which there are divergent opinions. So far as I am concerned, I am against nomination. These nominations were removed in 1924 even when we were ruled by the Britishers. Now when we are ruled by ourselves, it is better that this provision of nomination should be deleted. It is no doubt the object of Government to include as Members certain experts to advise the Panchayat but it is very difficult to get such persons in the taluks. In any case, I do not think there would be any difficulty in getting them elected.

When the object of these Boards is the betterment and development of the taluk, I think they should function on non-party lines. If these Taluk Boards are to work on non-party lines it is better that nominations are avoided. District Development Committees are already there; these are nothing but nominated bodies. They will supervise and guide the Taluk Boards. So there is no necessity to keep two nominated bodies—one at the district level and another practically nominated body at the taluk level.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Nomination to the District Development Council is not done at the discretion of the Government but the nomination is done by a statute.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—They are more or less nominated bodies. The object of the Government is to nominate experts. In the District, there will be an Engineer, a Health officer, a Medical Officer and so on. They can give advice to and do supervision over the Taluk Board and it is not necessary that such persons should be represented by nominating them in the Taluk Boards. That is how I put it.

In the Taluk Boards, the Chief Executive Officer is given too much power. He is the whole and sole authority and the Taluk Board is simply an advisory body. If we analyse the powers, we will find that the Taluk Board members can only recommend that such and such work be taken up and they can also pass the budget; beyond that they have no control. In my humble opinion, more powers should be given to the Taluk Board rather than to the Chief Executive Officer.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—It is more or less a Corporation.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Another thing is, the Chief Executive Officer is a Government servant, while these are elected bodies. The villagers are illiterate and ignorant and this officer being an educated man and being a Government servant, tries to boss over the members of the Board and it is very difficult to control him. There cannot be any co-operation between the two.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Krishnarajanagar).—What is the extent of power that you would like these bodies to have and what in your opinion is the kind of power that has to be vested in the Taluk Board or its President ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—There are so many provisions and each of them will have to be discussed in detail. It is not a question of discussing one or two provisions. He has been given so much powers that they will have to be discussed in detail. I will say later as to what should be the position of the Government Officer.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—I would like to be enlightened on this point. The Taluk Board will certainly enunciate certain policies; they may take a decision to undertake a particular work. There ends the matter. Do you want the members to interfere in the day to day execution of the work or do you want to leave it entirely to the officer to execute the work ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—What is the object in getting the Members elected ? They must have a voice in the chalking out of policy and in the execution of the work.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—With regard to the duties of the President, it is stated that he will preside at the meetings of the Board and its standing committees, keep a watch over the financial and executive administration of the Board and exercise general supervision and control. Over and above such powers of the President, what other powers do you want the President to have, as opposed to the powers of the Executive Officer ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—As I said these are matters of details. I will have to explain them. The powers that are now given to the Chief Executive Officer are many and they are too much. He should not be given so much powers.

The next point is about the staff. So far as the Secretary or the Executive Officer or members of the staff are concerned, a separate cadre is provided for. They have to work under the nominated or elected bodies. They are neither subordinate to the Government, say the Collector or the Commissioner, nor to the Taluk Boards or the Panchayats. If there is no harmony there cannot be smooth work. They are just like the District School Boards in the Bombay area. The administrative officer, the chief head of the office, is a Government servant while the members of the School Board are elected. They have no control over the office. If any action is to be taken against him, they have simply to report to the Government. He, being a Government servant, naturally much time will lapse and he always escapes punishment and nothing can be done. In my opinion, either he should be purely a Government servant or should be a servant of the Board. Then there will be smooth working. The second point is, these officers should be made transferable.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—They are transferable.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—The question of transfer becomes very hard. That provision can be made practicable provided he is a Government servant. But if he is a servant of the local authority the transfer becomes very difficult. For example, there is an Engineer for the Belagaum District and there is also an Engineer for Chickmagalur District which is a smaller District. The ormer draws Rs. 800; the salary is much and the responsibility is also much. The latter district is small. Here the work is equal to the work of a Deputy Engineer.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—There is no uniform law now.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—You can have districts of uniform size after ten years, but you have to enforce the law as it is to-day. An Engineer of Belgaum District can be transferred to

a smaller district like Karwar or an Engineer of Karwar District can work in the other District. What about the pay scales? Here he draws Rs. 200-300; there he draws Rs. 800.

3 P.M.

Secondly who has to transfer these officers? For example the Taluk Board will say that they are independent and do not want a Chief Officer. What can we do in such a situation? I know in Bombay such a law was made but could not be implemented as it was found impracticable. If these are Government Officers, they can be transferred. Otherwise the provision for transfers will only remain on the statute and it will be difficult to enforce it. The Taluk Board will be an independent body and if they say that they do not want such and such person, we cannot force him upon them.

Lastly, about the Revenue Officers. These officers have been entrusted with supervision and rendering guidance. The enforcement of this Act entirely rests on the co-operation and guidance of the Revenue Officers. What is the *position* of the Revenue Officers? They are already over-worked and would it be advisable to ask them to do this work also? Of course, that in course of time their work would be lessened is a point for consideration. But, as it is today, they have got too much work and if this work is also entrusted to them, the implementation would only remain on paper. For instance, if report is made to the Deputy Commissioner, he has no time to look into it. He will only ask the clerk to attend to it and the clerk will make enquiries and put up a note and the Deputy Commissioner will simply intial it. The alternative suggestion is that he should be an Officer of the rank of Commissioner for Local Authorities. He should have an independent staff and he must be entirely left to this work. Otherwise if the Revenue Officers are to attend to this work, it would be very difficult for them to attend to this work for want of time.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House now rises and would meet after half an hour.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

SRI H. V. KOUJALGI.—Sir, I have come almost to the end of my speech. I was referring to the fact that the Revenue Officers who are to implement this Act have multifarious duties to perform and I therefore suggested that the implementation of this Act should not be entrusted to the Revenue Officers. The question will now arise as to who should take up this responsibility or to whom this work should be entrusted. My suggestion is that there should be an independent Officer for each district. You may call him as an Officer for local authority or by any other name. He should have sufficient staff, he should have auditors and he should be responsible for inspection and audit of the accounts of the panchayats and the Taluk Boards. Only then could immediate attention be given. If any help is required by panchayat or if anything goes wrong in panchayat, he can immediately go there and set things right. If the work is entrusted to the Commissioners or the Deputy Commissioners, as I have already said, the work will be done by some clerk in the office. He will report on the matter and the Assistant Collector or whoever he may be will simply sign or say 'yes' to the note put up to him. In that case there will not be proper implementation. As a result of this Act, we will have panchayats and Taluk Boards all over the district and the work will be enormous. It is better that the implementation of this Act or control of these bodies is given to a separate department. A separate department should be created for this purpose. Of course, they may be Revenue Officers or any other Officer, but they must be exclusively in charge of this work.

SRI A. S. PATIL (Nargund).—How are they connected with the implementation of this Act?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—If the Hon'ble Member looks to Chapter XII, he will find that the inspection of local authority has to be done by the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner. Such a control will be made by so many departments-some by the Revenue Officers and some by the Audit Department and so on. So, it is better that the controlling authority should be one, instead of being several.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN.—If a Panchayat Officer at district level is appointed will that serve the purpose?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—The question would be to whom he should be subordinate to.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN.—To the Collector.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—My point is that the Collector is already overworked and he will not be able to extract work from the Panchayat Officers? In Bombay State, formerly, this work was entrusted to the Commissioners, as suggested in this Bill. It became unmanageable. In each district there will be a number of village panchayats and Taluk Boards. The Commissioners could not control the panchayats and so they asked the local boards to appoint their own auditors. There were two sets of auditors-one by the local boards and the other by the Government and they always worked under the Collector or the Commissioner and whenever any mal-practice or mismanagement or irregularity happened, they could not pay immediate attention. Subsequently, it was thought that there should be a separate department or a separate officer and he was designated as the Commissioner for Local Authority and the entire work was entrusted to him. The auditors, the inspection staff and the supervising staff under him and he could pay immediate attention. A number of panchayats and taluk boards will come into existence after this Act comes into force and the point is whether the Collector who has to perform so many duties can manage, control and supervise this work also. I do not say that he is incompetent or that it is not his concern, but the main point is that he has already got many duties to perform and in the midst of his multifarious duties it will not be possible for him to pay sufficient attention to the implementation of this Act.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—The Executive Officers or the Chief Officers will be attending to the day-to-day work and it is only in very rare cases that the Deputy Commissioner will have to interfere.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—The question of audit comes.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—You have a separate department for that.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Why should the auditor work in one department and the controlling authority in another department? Why not bring them under one department? Apart from audit, some regular inspection on administrative lines is quite necessary. Only then can we see that the Act is implemented according to the rules and bye-laws. If we leave the whole matter to the control of the Chief Officer, nobody would check his work. As I said in the beginning, the Secretary or the Chief Officer or the Engineers concerned will be working under these bodies and they should be Government servants so that they can be controlled by the local authority or by the District Officer. At least, there should be some Head of the Department who can control these officers. Otherwise, they will be neither the servants of the board nor that of the Government.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chicknayakanahalli).—What is your suggestion regarding that? Under whom should they work?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—They should be the servants of the Government. Then, naturally, they will be under the control of the District Officer.

The Bill provides that there will be a village panchayat for a population of 1,500 up to 10,000 and no discrimination has been made so far as these panchayats are concerned. In the interest of better working of these panchayats, it would be better to classify the panchayats on income basis. For example, panchayats having an income of Rs. 5,000 may be

classified into one category, panchayats having an income varying from Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 10,000 into another category and panchayats having an income from Rs. 10,000 onwards into a third category. This will facilitate the working of the panchayats, because the question of payment of salaries to the Secretaries and other staff comes in. The Bill provides for the appointment of a Secretary to a panchayat and we cannot make any discrimination so far as his pay is concerned. Supposing there is a village panchayat with a normal population of 1,500. It cannot have an income of more than Rs. 3,000. In that case that panchayat will not be able to pay its Secretary the same salary which a bigger panchayat will be able to pay. So, we will have to make a distinction between Secretaries and Secretaries. Moreover, work in smaller panchayats will be small. So, it is better that these panchayats should be classified on income basis.

So far as tenure is concerned, it is a minor detail and I do not like to go into these minor details at this stage.

I thank the Chair for having given me so much time and I close my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri V. S. Patil. The time limit is 20 minutes.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—I will try to finish within that time.

Sir, before I touch upon the various provisions of the Bill brought by the Government for the consideration of this House, I shall try to point out to this House that article 40 of our Constitution gives this Government or the State some powers regarding the panchayats. Article 40 runs thus:

> "The State shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government."

[SRI J. H. SHAMSUDDIN in the Chair.]

So the emphasis is to enable them to function as self-governing units. The next thing which I should like to refer to is article 43 wherein a living wage is to be given to all the persons concerned, and also to article 44 which states:

> "The State shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a uniform civil code throughout the territory of India."

We have to study whether this Bill has really complied with the desire that is expressed or the directions contained in the basic Articles of the Constitution of our country. We have another authoritative book which has been published by the Central Government and that is Report of the Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service Vol. I. This book is a very important book so far as the re-organisation of the local bodies, *i.e.*, gramapanchayats is concerned. I should like to refer to certain pertinent remarks made by this committee so far as the constitution of these local bodies is concerned. They have said outright that the *ad hoc* committees appointed for the execution of the National Extension Schemes and the Development Blocks have proved a failure and the committee has recommended that these powers should be handed over to the elected representatives. This point has been mentioned in this book:

> "It is not infrequently that delegation of power is mistaken for decentralisation. The former does not divest the Government of the ultimate responsibility for the actions of the authority to whom power is delegated; this authority is under the control of the Government and is in every way subordinate to it. Decentralisation, on the other hand, is a process whereby the Government divests itself completely of certain duties and responsibilities and devolves them on to some other authority."

We have to see whether we have decentralisation or delegation of powers today so far as the local bodies are concerned. The Central Government and big personalities have stated that there must be decentralisation of powers rather than delegation. If we are to study this Bill with this background, then we have to see whether the directives of this committee, as well as the Constitution have been followed or not. Before I enter into......

Sri G. ANNA RAO (Afzalpur).—These are the recommendations of the Team and they were sent for comment to various Governments and many Governments have sent their comments in this regard. We do not know the comment of Mysore Government.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It is for that purpose I raised this question. These recommendations were sent to State Governments and are to be accepted or rejected or desired to be modified. Practically all the governments have submitted their opinions. Yesterday the Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that this Government also had given their opinion.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—I would like to make the matter clear. The recommendations of the Balwantrai Mehta Committee were sent to Mysore Government and are before them. Yesterday, I ascertained that we have adopted some of those recommendations. I am told that the recommendations have not been sent back.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—In the third volume opinions of all the State Governments have appeared excepting those of Kerala and Mysore, I suppose.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—We have adopted some of them.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Yesterday I made a request to let us know whether the Mysore Government had sent their opinion either by way of acceptance or rejection or modification. But it appears this Government has done nothing.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—We have adopted some of their recommendations.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—We must have a report of that.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Why? It is not necessary.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The recommendations the State Government have accepted, the recommendations they have rejected, the recommendations that are not necessary to be implemented for the present and may be taken up at some other time—the views of the State Government on these points ought to have been placed before us so that we could have touched on them where we differed.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—I would like to know whether in any other State the recommendations of the Balwantrai Mehta Committee have been placed before the Legislature. No, it is not necessary. It is at the Government level these things are examined, and some recommendations have been accepted and some not.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—That is why I asked that when this committee has published the opinions sent by various Government why this Government alone had not sent their opinion.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Local Self-Government to the views already expressed by this Government in respect of one or two items relating to the constitution of panchyats that at the block level an elected self-governing institution should be set up with jurisdiction co-extensive with the development block. The Mysore Government along with the Kerala Government has not expressed its opinion in respect of other points. That is why this House is entitled to know the items on which this Government has expressed its opinion, and the items reserved for separate examination. That will help discussion on the subject in a more intelligent manner.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Whatever recommendations we have accepted have been incorporated in the Bill and we have intimated the Planning Commission accordingly.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Is it the opinion of the Hon'ble Minister that we should grasp and try to find out the recommendations accepted by this Government by reading through and comparing the whole of the Bill with the recommendations made by that Team? That would rather be difficult. Even now I feel that we are entitled to know which of the recommendations this Government have accepted and which of them they have rejected.

4 P.M.

We have to see, Sir, whether this Government is of opinion that there must be delegation of power or decentralisation of power. This is not clear

from the attitude assumed by this Government. Everywhere in this country, as well as in foreign countries it has been felt that there must be decentralisation of power. But, if we read the provisions of this Bill, what we find is mere delegation of powers with some limitations and ultimately, it can be seen that this Bill is nothing but an eye-wash. It gives practically no powers to the local bodies and I should like to point out the present position in the Bombay area. The village panchayets in Bombay area are autonomous bodies. They are fully elected. They are vested with full executive powers; they can appoint the secretary, and also dismiss him. The budget is subject to the approval of the District Board only and village panchayats are established in a village or groups of villages where the population is more than 1,000. So far as income is concerned, they get 30 per cent of the land revenue and they have powers of supervision on primary education. These are things which are already in existence in respect of the existing village panchayats in the Bombay area. But when we read the provisions of this Bill, we find that such powers have been taken away from the gram panchayats. The proposed panchayats are practically consultative bodies and all executive powers have been taken over by the Government from the *gram*.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—It is an improvement.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It is not an improvement.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I just want to know the provision under which the Government will be managing the village panchayat. I have gone through every clause of the Bill and to my knowledge, I have not seen any such provision. Will the Hon'ble Member enlighten me and show me the clauses where the Government have taken over the executive powers of the village panchayats ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I will show the clauses where the Government has interfered so far as the Bombay area is concerned. I may point out generally, that all these powers are sought to be taken away. In the Bombay area, there is a committee of the gram panchayet called School Committee which controls and supervises the primary education in that village ; and in the present Bill, there is absolutely no reference to any kind of supervision or any committee that can be appointed by the gram panchayet or village panchayet so far as primary education is concerned. On the contrary, the gram panchayats are liable to pay from their funds for the construction of school buildings and to meet the expenditure on primary education. The burden is thrown upon the panchayat as well as the Taluk Board. But powers are not given to them. That is not the case at present in the Bombay area.

I may point out Sir, about finances, clause 69, even in Bombay......

Sri A. S. PATIL.— Even in Bombay area, the panchayet is not controlling primary education.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—In the Bombay area, the village panchayet is entitled to appoint or elect or is bound to elect a committee called the School Committee. That committee has got powers to visit schools inspect and recommend anything to the School Board. That power is not here in this Bill.

About finances, Sir, if it is our intention to give local bodies some self-respect, and to decentralise powers, then there is no question of delegation of property. The property in a particular village must vest in the panchayat automatically just as it is done in the cases of the Taluk Board. So far as property is concerned, in the Bombay area, all properties existing within particular limits which do not belong either to the Government or to an individual, vests in the particular body. Such provision ought to be there so far as the village panchayats are concerned.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Yes. Is it not there now ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The existing property within particular limits must automatically vest in the local bodies, either in the Taluk Board or in the village panchayat. There must be a

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

provision to that effect. That is wanting here. There is a provision to the effect that if they acquire certain property or if the Government hands over any property to them, they become the owners of that property. That is not correct. It is against the principle of decentralisation of powers.

So far as the Secretary is concerned, my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik asked me to show the clause by which executive power has been taken away from the local bodies. For that purpose, I should like to point out section 79.

> "Every Panchayet shall have a Secretary who shall be the servant of the Panchayet appointed by the Commissioner in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed."

Sir, the Secretary is at present appointed by the village panchayet Act in the Bombay area.

In the Bombay area, they are servants by the Village Panchayats. The pay scales are fixed by the Government; but the officers are appointed by the village panchayats. Their work is supervised by the executive officer. If there is any neglect of duty they can dismiss them without any further difficulty.

SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—By appointing the Secretary, does it mean that the Government takes away executive powers. The Secretary is an executive of the panchayat. He is there to look after so many duties. If a village panchayat appoints a secretary that panchayat will have to keeep him for good or for bad. The present arrangement is very good. To say that the executive powers of the village panchayats have been taken away is not correct.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—If we read this section along with sections 80 and 81, it is quite clear that no disciplinary action can be taken by the village panchayat against the secretary. They can take action against minor servants and there is also an appeal against the action taken by the secretary against minor servants. But as regards the duties of the secretary, power is not given to the village panchayat. So far as the present Bill is concerned, as it stands, it is clear that the village panchayat cannot control this officer. In the case of the Taluk Board also the executive officer is a Government servant, appointed by the Government. He is responsible to the Taluk Board in the same way as the Secretary is responsible to the village panchayat. The Executive Officers are appointed by the Government and are controlled by the Government.

SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—In the case of the Corporation, the Commissioner is not responsible to the Mayor. He is the person who controls the finance. It is necessary for the safety of the body itself. While the village panchayat is entitled to sanction any scheme of work, the executive officer does it. How does this affect the village panchayat?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—The question of Corporations is practically an All-India question. A corporation is meant for big cities. There is one corporation in this State and in Bombay there are three. These corporations were started by the Britishers when they were in power and since they wanted to keep the executive authority in their own hands they created those posts. Moreover the business of the corporation cannot be compared to the business of the village panchayat. The business to be done by the village panchayat is very little.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.— Is it the case of the Hon'ble Member that the secretary, so far as the panchayats are concerned, and the executive officer so far as the Taluk Boards are concerned should be subject to the disciplinary action of the local bodies and also that the local boards should have powers to dismiss those officers if they fail in their duties?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—I would like to mention that such powers are already there in the Bombay area. We should like to make the executive officers responsible to these bodies. The present Ministry, the Cabinet as such, is responsible to this House and is a representative of this House. The

same method should be followed in the case of local bodies.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—If there is any maladministration, you cannot hold the Government responsible.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If there is maladministration, there is a separate provision, *i.e.*, power given to Government under sections 198 and 199. The Commissioners have been given powers to supersede or to do anything. There are two sections to which a reference may be made at this stage and these are sections 196 and 197. These are two very important sections in this Bill. These two sections will show that the Deputy Commissioner has been given such vast powers as to suspend the executive and any work of the village panchayat or Taluk Board. Not only that. Under Section 197, the Deputy Commissioner can get anything done and even suspend the executive. These bodies are reduced practically to nothing if their work can be suspended or they are compelled to do anything and finally recover the amount from them. This will go to show that the entire executive power has been concentrated in the Government. That is not proper. They say that they want to divest themselves of certain powers and give them to the people, but they are doing the opposite. This is merely a farce.

*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I should say that the Hon'ble Member is wrong. In the normal course, the Deputy Commissioner does not utilise that power. It is only in extraordinary circumstances that the Deputy Commissioner would interfere. Please read the definition of the section.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Section 197 says that he has such a power. The Deputy Commissioner may say that the expenditure, etc., charged is not in public interest and therefore suspend the work.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to bring to the notice of Sri Mallaradhya and Sri Patil that a similar provision is there in the District Boards Act of old Mysore and even in the Town Municipalities Act. Within my experience of 25 years, I have not come across one single instance of a Deputy Commissioner taking recourse to this section. This provision is meant as a sefeguard to prevent certain undesirable things.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Then, Sir, I will deal with the Budget provision here. It is rather strange. The Budget provision in this Bill is covered by section 69 read with section 76. As I said, section 76 "Grant by Government" is strange. When we are going to create autonomous bodies, why should this word 'Grant' be introduced here ? A certain portion of the land revenues should be automatically set aside for these local bodies. 'Grant' is quite a different thing. Under the Bombay Government, the local bodies were getting thirty per cent of the land revenue and it is now cut down to fifteen per cent ; can it be called a progressive or a regressive measure? I think, Sir, that this Government wants to go back from the advance already made. There is a saying in our language. " ಗಾಯೀ ಚೀ ಶಿಂಗೇ ಮೋಹನ್ ವಾಸರೂ ಕರಣೆ " I will translate it into English. " If a full grown milking cow, with tall horns is to be passed amongst calves, you just cut off her horns and the hoofs to make it look like a calf." That is the way we are being treated.

Sri A BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Is it an interpretation or misinterpretation of the provision ? The Taluk Boards are given 15 per cent of the State revenue and the village panchayats 15 per cent and the remaining 20 per cent is kept over. In Bombay area there are no Taluk Boards. Here the Taluk Board does all the work. Here there is co-ordination and co-operation between the two.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—My friend has forgotten that there is a local cess of 4 annas leviable by the Government with the consent of the local authority. Already three annas in the rupee has been levied. In this Bill you have recommended that only 12 naye paise should be levied. That is how you want to reduce local cess.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—You please remember how much of local cess goes to the School Board?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It may be taken over for primary education, provided you hand over charge of the management of the primary institutions to these bodies. If you don't want to hand over management, then you must bear the expenditure. So far as grants and allotment of land revenue is concerned, it is my view, not the view of the Bombay Government, that the whole of land revenue must revert back to the village panchyats and Taluk Boards.

I now come to the constitution of the Taluk Local Boards. In our State there are taluks with a population ranging from 10,000 to 30,000. A reorganisation of the taluks as well as the districts is quite essential if these bodies are to function on a basis of equality. A reorganisation should be taken up by the Government. Taluk Development Boards are to be constituted on indirect election. Why this indirect election? In the case of the Legislative Council and the Rajya Sabha, members are elected by indirect election. They have no executive powers at all. The executive powers are given to those who are elected by the direct method. From this House members are taken to the Cabinet. The Cabinet is responsible to us because we are directly elected.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Even here there is one nomination.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Those bodies constituted by indirect election are for deliberation, not for execution. They are not expected to have executive powers. These Taluk Boards also should be elected and not constituted by indirect election. In Clause 96, there is provision for nomination. Even the Congress Party is not for nomination. We support that proposition.

Then I have to say a word about the executive officers. So far as our area is concerned, the local bodies have their own officers. They control them; they appoint them; they dismiss them. From this Bill it appears that the Executive Officer is a servant of the Government, is responsible to the Government and his terms and conditions of service are to be determined by the Government. That means he will nevercare for the Taluk Board; he will never care for their decisions and it would amount to merely creating a sort of machinery that would take away the powers vested in the local bodies

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—In the Bombay area how often the executive officers and Secretaries have been dismissed because they do not belong to certain communities or because they do not dance to the tune of the President or the Chairman? I want to know your experience in the Bomay area.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—In Bombay area I was a member of the various district bodies for about 10 or 15 years and up till now there is not a single instance so far as our District is concerned, when an executive officer was dismissed. I have not heard of any such instance in any other District except of course that we had to dismiss an administrative officer under the School Board. That was because we received a cart-load of complaints against him and when he was unable to face the enquiry, he resigned and went away. That is the only instance which I have come across in the whole of thirty years of experience. The power given to those bodies will never be exercised unless it is very pertinent. There must be some check on the working. Even supposing the Chief Executive Officer is a Government servant, he must in some way be responsible to that body. Provision should be made to ensure that when the Panchayat or the Taluk Board passed a resolution condemning a particular officer, the Government must take immediate steps to see that he is removed or transferred from that place. Such a provision is not here. In Bombay they are not Government servants at all; they are servants of the Local Board. In Bombay there are no cases where the executive officers were dismissed on political, communal or other grounds. The question is whether you are going to rely upon the conscience and the goodwill of the people or you want to continuously feed them by spoon for years together. You have to rely upon them. The Committee on Plan Projects made a very pertinent remark in their Report which I should like to read to you:

4-30 P.M.

"It must not be cramped by too much control by the Government or Government agencies. It must have the power to make mistakes and to learn by making mistakes, but it must also receive guidance . . ."

That is the recommendation of the Committee. Supposing one or two panchayats were to commit mistakes, that should not be ground enough for removing them. The Taluk Boards should be made fully representative and given proper incentive and should not be mere deliberative bodies. All this reorganisation is being done for the execution of the National Extension Schemes and Development works. But there is not a single reference to them in this Bill. But, if the Government is pleased to give certain work to them, then only Taluk Boards can interfere. I suggest that automatically all these works must be handed over to these bodies for execution.

Another thing which I would like to mention is that primary education has not been handed over to any of these bodies. On the contrary, under clause 127 though the Taluk Boards have to construct school buildings, etc., control is with the Government. The Taluk Boards have to spend money but have no control. Similarly under clause 128 (b) approval of Government is necessary for expenditure. So, both these bodies, the Taluk Boards and the Panchayats, have been given powers which are an eye-wash to the people and no real power has been transferred or proposed to be transferred to them.

So, this Bill has to be recast with a view to give complete power to these bodies.

I shall now refer to the last part of this Bill, *i.e.*, establishment of District Development Boards. These are practically nothing. It is only the Deputy Commissioner who is the head and who can control. These bodies have absolutely no power. It is as if these bodies assemble when a Collector or Deputy Commissioner calls them and on the latter placing some matters before them, taking tea and dispersing. That is not proper and is not decentralisation or even delegation of power. It will amount to taking away the power by the executive. We strongly oppose this and want that real power should be transferred to the local bodies and they should take up works, such as what are being done in the Bombay area. What happens now is that even though several crores of rupees are being spent, people are not taking part. To create some enthusiasm in them it is essential that they must be given some powers of execution and supervision.

Therefore, I submit to this House that this Bill should be considered very seriously. There should be decentralisation of power and autonomous bodies must be created. Instead, if the Government wants to keep these powers with them, then, certainly there will be no development in our country.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಹಳ ಅಭಿನಂದನಾರ್ಹವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ನಾನು ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದಿನವರೆಗೆ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಆಕ್ಟೇ ಬೇರೆ, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಕ್ಟೇ ಬೇರೆ ಇದ್ದು ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕೂಡ ಇತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಕೆಲಸವೇನು, ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಕೆಲಸವೇನು, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಕೆಲಸವೇನು, ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವೇನು ಎಂಬುದು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಡಳಿತ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಸಂಬಂಧವೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದೇ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಷಯ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬಿಲ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಎಙ್ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಸಮಿತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದು ದೇಶವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸುತ್ತಿ, ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಬರೀ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೇ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯಿತ್ತು. ಹಾಗೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಈಗಿನ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್)

ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ ತಯಾರಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಅಭಿನಂದನಾರ್ಹರೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ 5 ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಗಗಳ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಒಂದುಗೂಡಿಸಲು ಎಲ್ಲರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಪಾತ್ರವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಂತೋಷ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 5—10 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿ ಬೇಕಾದಾಗ ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದೇನು ಮಹಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರ? ವಜಾಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಆಗ 10 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳವಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರೆಸಿವ್ ಮೆಷರ್ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೇನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು? ಆಲ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಕೇಡರ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಬಹುದು. ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಬಳಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಲ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಕೇಡರ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, 1881ರಲ್ಲೋ ಏನೋ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿರುವ ಆಕ್ಟ್. It is not the latest Act. It does not redound to the credit of any person. ಸ್ವರಾಜ್ಯ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಗಿ ಅದರ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ದೊರೆಯಿತು. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಹಣ ಅವರ ಕೈಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಬಾರದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ದುಡ್ಡಿನ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ. ಅವರ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಅರ್ಥ ನನಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೆ power ಯಾರಿಗೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಒಬ್ಬ ಎಕ್ಸಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಆಫೀಸರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು execute ಮಾಡುವವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೆಲಸ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆಕ್ ಮಾಡೋಣ, ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ದುಡ್ಡು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರವೂ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 'Watch over' ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಶಬ್ದಗಳಿವೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ "The Mayor may watch over and control......" supervise and control ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟದಿಂದ ನಾವು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಜೀವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಬೆಲೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟದೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರದ ಐನೂರು ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ minimum limit ಮತ್ತು 10,000 ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ maximum limitಗೆ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಲ್ಲ. 1,500 ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಂದರೆ 300 ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಯಿತು. ಇಂಥ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಆದಾಯ ಸುಮಾರು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ತರಬೇತು ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅವನು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತನಾಗಿ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವಂಥ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಉಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥವನಿಗೆ ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದು, ಎಂದರೆ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಸಂಬಳಕ್ಕೇ ಹೋದರೆ 300 ಮನೆಗಳಿರುವ ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಗಮನಿಸಿದರೆ 1,500 ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಮದರಾಸಿನಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ 15—20 ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರಿಂದ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಆದಾಯವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ತರಬೇತು ಪಡೆದ ಒಬ್ಬ ದಕ್ಷನಾದ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆದೀತೇ ವಿನಾ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ.

Obligatory and discretionary functions ಎಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಒತ್ತಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಊರಿನ ಹತ್ತಿರವಿರುವ ಕಾಡು, ಊರಿನ ಮಗ್ಗುಲಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಿ ಇವುಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ, ಊರಿನ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳು, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, "ಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಾಸು, ಕೋಣೆ ತಂಬ ಹಾಸು" ಎಂಬ ಗಾದೆಯಂತೆ ಇದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ರವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾ

ಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 20 ಕೋಟಿ, 30 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯವಿದ್ದಂಥ ಒಂದಾನೊಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಾನೊಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಬಾಬಿನಿಂದಲೇ ದೇಶದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯವಿದ್ದಂಥ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಬಂದಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ sources of income hundred-fold. ಇದೆ. ಇಂಥದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ land revenue ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಕಷ್ಟ? ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ಅವು self-governing agencies ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹಣದ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬು ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಸೆಸ್ ಹಂಕುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅವು ಆಯಾ ಬಾಬುಗಳಿಗೇ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ರೈತನು ತಾನು ಕೊಡುವ ಕಂದಾಯವು ತನ್ನ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ, ತನ್ನ ಊರಿನ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದರೆ ಅವನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೂ ಶಾಂತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯವರು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದರ ಆದಾಯ ವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಅದು ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೇ ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Primary Education is mainly the concern of the State Government. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ್ದು. ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ 500 ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯುಳ್ಳ ಊರುಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು 300ಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಶಾಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಆದಾಯವೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಗೇ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನೂ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—On a point of information, Sir. I did not say that Primary Education should be the main concern of the Village Panchayats. But there must be a committe of the Village Panchayats which should supervise for primary education in that village. The expenses has to be met by the Government and the District School Board and not by the Village Panchayat.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—Dual control ಇದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವ ಶಾಲೆಯೂ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಇದ್ದು, curriculum ಇದ್ದು regular system ಇದ್ದು ಅದರಂತೆ ಶಾಲೆಗಳು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರಬೇಕಾದರ ಅದನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯವರು ಸೂಪರ್‌ವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಗೆ ಪಾಠ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ; curriculum ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, it will be more an interfering body than a regulating body.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬಳಿ,—ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೂ ಸ್ಕೂಲಿಗೂ ಏನೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಮ್ಮಕು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೂ ಸ್ಕೂಲು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಇವೊತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸೂಪರ್‌ವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ provide ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ? For the information of Sri Patil, I may say, that there is a provision in the Bill under discretionary functions of panchayats which is as follows :

> "A Panchayat may also make provision for carrying out within the village any other work or measure which is likely to promote the health, safety, education, comfort, convenience or social or economic well being of the inhabitants of the village."

Therefore for educational development they can appoint committees ; that is not prohibited. Only, the responsibility of running primary education is with Government. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ 1,500 ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಿರುವ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗೆಷ್ಟು ಆದಾಯವಿದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆದಾಯವಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದೂ ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗಿರುವ Establishment ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಕೂಡ meet ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ provision has been made for secretaries being appointed compulsorily.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾವ್.–17ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಐದು ಮೈಲಿ radius ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡಿಸಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೆರಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು 3,000 ದಿಂದ 5,000 ದವರೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಿರುವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು group ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆದಾಯವಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. 1,500 ಎಂದು limit ಹಾಕಿರುವುದನ್ನು 300ಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು; 1,000ಕ್ಕೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್)

ಏರಿಸಿದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅವರು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ದಕ್ಷರಾದವರನ್ನೇ ನೇಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸಲಹೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—3,000 ವೆಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 600 ಮನೆಗಳು ಇರುವ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಒಂದು centre ನಲ್ಲಿ village panchayat ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ limits ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದವು. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ರಸ್ತೆಯೂ ಅವರ ಕಾರ್ಯಭಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೂರು ಮೈಲಿಯ ಪರಿಧಿಯೆಂದರೆ Inter-village ರಸ್ತೆ ಕೂಡ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡೇ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಲಿ, ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಬೋರ್ಡೇ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಲಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಮಾಡಲಿ, ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ Inter-village ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, Inter-village limit is not within the village itself. One village is within one mile and another within half a mile. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಎಲ್ಲ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಣದ ಬಲವಿರುವಂತೆ, ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಶೇಕಡ 15 ಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಶೇಕಡ 40 ನ್ನು direct ಆಗಿಯೂ, ಉಳಿದ ಶೇಕಡ 10-20ನ್ನು consolidate ಮಾಡಿಯೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲ್‌ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಏಕೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. Grant ಎಂದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಧರ್ಮ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ! ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳವರು ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ inferiority complex ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬಂದದ್ದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಫಂಡು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ deficit ಇದೆಯೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ obligatory duties ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿವೆ. Village development ಆದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ಜನರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ Deputy Commissioner ನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವೇ ಹಾಕಬಹುದೆಂದಿದೆ. ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಬಲಾತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ detail ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. General principles ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ ಪದವನ್ನೂ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ನೂರರಷ್ಟು ಒಂದು ಕಾಸೂ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. Land Revenue ವನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಫಂಡು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೆನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು flea bite ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ. ಲೋಕಲ್ ಸೆಲ್ಫ್ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಇನ್ನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಖರ್ಚಿನದೇನ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Parallel Bodies ಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವಯಾವುದೋ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, S.K. Dey ಮುಂತಾದವರ ಸ್ಕೀಮುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದೇನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ? ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ, N.E.S. ಬ್ಲಾಕಿನ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಧ ಭಾಗವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರಿಗೆ, village worker ಗಳಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಂದ ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಅದೇನು ಕಪ್ಪು ಬಳಿಯುವುದೋ ಎನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನರಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು.

5 P.M.

ಅದೇ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡು, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗೆ ಆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಈಗ ಏನು ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಎನ್.ಇ.ಎಸ್.ನವರು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ 100ರಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಣ ದುರ್ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದು ನಿಲ್ಲುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು? ಹಣ ದುರ್‌ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗಬೇಕೇ? ಸದ್ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗಬೇಡವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಎನ್.ಇ.ಎಸ್. ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೂ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಅವರು ಅದೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಫಿಯರೆನ್ಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇದಕ್ಕೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ ದಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಾಗ ಹುಲಿ ಮೈಮೇಲೆ ಬಿದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—Will the Government reorganise the Taluk Boards so that they may correspond with the area of the block development ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN (SRI J. H. SHAMSUDDIN).—No, it is not proper. You are asking an Hon'ble Member to explain the policy of the Government, instead of asking him to clarify his point.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—If I have no right, I will sit down. This is a thing which should be followed by every one in the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—You are asking the Hon'ble Member to explain the policy of Government. How is it possible? You can ask the Hon'ble Minister when he is on his legs.

Sri B. V. DESAI (Gangavati).—On a point of o der, Sir. An Hon'ble Member was speaking. Another Hon'ble Member, Sri Anna Rao wanted some clarification on some point. The Hon'ble Member who was speaking yielded and he asked the question. I would like to know whether it is out of order to ask for clarification from Government on points which the Hon'ble Member raised.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It is usual for members to intervene in the debate. I yielded. The Hon'ble Member might have put a question which either the Hon'ble Minister can answer or if I know, I can answer. There is not much difficulty, after all, Sir. Please allow me to continue the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Sri Sivappa wanted to say some thing ?

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—Sir, if the Minister gives a reply to a member who is speaking, and if others feel that the reply needs some clarification, is it not open to us to ask questions ? My point is the same as the point of order raised by Hon'ble friend Shri B. V. Desai.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I do not object to the Hon'ble Member intervening and putting a question to the Hon'ble Member who is on his legs, provided he yields. But the issue is whether the point raised was directed to the member who was speaking or whether it was meant for the Hon'ble Minister. I think it is not proper to ask the Hon'ble Minister to reply to a stray point when another Hon'ble Member is speaking.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—I had to ask that question because the Hon'ble Minister replied to the point raised by Sri Bheemappa Naik.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Even at that stage, I think it will not be proper for a member to ask the Hon'ble Minister to reply to a question. You can put the question to the Hon'ble Member concerned, who is on his legs.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—When the question has been answered and a certain information is given, it becomes the property of the House. Another thing is, the member speaking yielded and therefore I put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—You can put the question to the Hon'ble Minister when he is on his legs.

The Hon'ble Member Sri Bheemappa Naik may proceed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಂತೆ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಿ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನವರು ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು entrust ಮಾಡ ಬಹುದು, ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಜಗಜಾಂತರ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಬರಬರುತ್ತಾ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕಾಭಿ ವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿದೆ. ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಡೈರಿ ಫಾರಂ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಅನೇಕ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಿನ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಅಭಿನಂದನೀಯ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ರೂಪಿತವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇದು ಒಂದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಪ್ರಿಪೇರ್ ಆಗಿ, ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ವರ್ಷಾಂತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಊರಿನ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಯಸ್ಕರನ್ನೂ (all the adult male members) ಕರೆದು ಅವರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ಇದು ಏಕೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಏನಾ ದರೂ ಇರಲಿ, ನನಗನಿಸುವುದು ಅದು ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ. ಯಾರು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಡೆಯರೋ, ಯಾರು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್)

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಏನೇನು ಮಾಡಿದೆವು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ? ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಊರಿನವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕರೆದು ಅವರ ಮುಂದೆ, ಇಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ? ಊರಿ ನವರು ಬರದಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—If the Hon'ble Member yields, I may tell him that such a provision exists in U.P., Bihar, Punjab and Assam. Also the Congress Committee which went into this question, has recommended it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಇರಲಿ, ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಷೇರ್‌ಹೋಲ್ಡರ್ಸ್ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಕರೆದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಜೆಟ್ ಪ್ರೊವಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಚರಂಡಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ಚರಂಡಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಇವರಿಗೂ ಜಗಳವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಠರಾವು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಐದು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಇಂತಿಷ್ಟು ಜನರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಂಥ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಠರಾವು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರ ಬೇಕು. ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಅರ್ಧದಷ್ಟು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕು. ಅಂದರೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. Any member can bring a no-confidence motion ಎಂದರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಜಗಳವಾಡಿದರೆ no confidence motion ತರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ no confidence motion ತಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳು ಪುನಃ ತರಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ನಿಯಮ ವಿರಬೇಕು. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ಹಾಕಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ? Not less than half the members of the Gram Panchayat might bring a no-confidence motion ಅಥವಾ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಎರಡುಭಾಗ ಆದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕು. ಅನಂತರ ಅಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಕರೆಯಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ನೇಮಕ ವಿಷಯ. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗೆ ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಎಕ್ಸಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಟ್ರೈನಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರೊಮೋಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಆಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. By promotion he might become a Taluk Board secretary. By further promotion, he might go to the municipalities. Can you allow him to stagnate? Would he work? Would he have enthusiasm? ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಆಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ efficiency ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ 50 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಲು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ autonomy ಇರಲಿ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಚೆಕ್ ಇರ ಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆಡಿಟ್ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಚೆಕ್ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಡಿವಿಜನಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಇರುವಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡು ವವರೂ ಅವರೇ, ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವವರೂ ಅವರೇ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಟ್ರೈನಿಂಗ್ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೂ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಇರಬೇಕು. It is a very sound provision. ಶ್ರೀ ಚೆನ್ನ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರಾಗಿ ದ್ದಾಗ ಅವರದೇ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಸ್ಟಾಫ್ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮದೇ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಸ್ಟಾಫ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Taluk Boards ಬಗ್ಗೆ most impracticable suggestions have been given. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ indirect election ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ areas ಮಾಡಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿ ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ತರದ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಯೆನ್ಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಿಂದ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿ ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತು ಭಾಗಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಯಿಂದ ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಯೆನ್ಸಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದರೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ purchasing and selling goes on; corrupt practices begin. ಎಂದರೆ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು? ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? Are they really elected? ಈ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Would that be real franchise? Would it be helpful? Is it correct? Therefore this system of indirect elections was not thought of formerly. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ. . . .

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—That paint requires a little scrutiny.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is oll right. I am glad that the Minister has conceded.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it the point of indirect elections or the point of delimitation of constituencies ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ್.—Indirect elections ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Influence ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು scrutiny ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು practicable ಇಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ direct election ಆಗುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕನಿಷ್ಠಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ಓಟರ್ಸ್ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯನನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿ ಕಳಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು. The franchise will be big enough. There will be more number of votes. ಆಗ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸುಲಭವಲ್ಲ. ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇಡೀ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಓಟಿಂಗ್ ಒಂದೇ ದಿವಸ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಡೀಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ದಿವಸ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಓಟು ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಎರಡು ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಓಟು ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಓಟು ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Hon'ble Member congratulated the Minister for bringing in a Bill which contains some sort of relation between Village Panchayats and other bodies. Now, if we accept the proposal of the Hon'ble Member, his congratulation appears ineffective.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಹೇಗೆ disconnect ಆಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾರು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ, ಯಾರಿಗೆ 21 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅವರು ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಓಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ disconnect ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ?

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—To help our friend, if he were to read clause 45, the relationship between the Taluk Board and the Panchayat would be clear.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಓಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಸಂಬಂಧ ತಪ್ಪುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಅನುಮಾನ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕೇಳಿರಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿರುವ ಸಂಬಂಧ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಧುರ ಬಾಂಧವ್ಯ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆಂದು ಓಟರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಆದರೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿಲ್ಲ. 20 ಜನ ಅಥವಾ 50 ಜನ ಸೇರಿ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯಕಾರಿ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗಿದೆ.—

> "Clause 46: Assignment of functions.—(1) Subject to any law for the time being in force, the Government may by notification and subject to such conditions as may be specified therein,—
>
> (*a*) transfer to any Panchayat the management and maintenance of a forest adjacent to the village;"

ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವನ ಬೆಳೆಸಿ ದನಕರುಗಳು ವಗೈರೆಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಚಳ್ಳಕೆರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಜೂರು ಎಂಬ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ಐದಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೊಗಸಾದ ಗಿಡ ಬೆಳೆಸಿ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಲೇಜ್ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟಾಗಿ ಏಕೆ ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ? Why should they ask the Government to take it over? The tendency in modern days is to see that each village has the privilege of owning a forest so that all the forest wealth of that particular village goes to the village panchayat. It would be a retrograde step to go and ask the Government to take it over.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಆದರೆ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟವಶಾತ್ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. Subject to this being passed, if they hand it over we have no objection to maintain it. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಭೂಮಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅದರ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದಿದೆ, ಬರುಬರುತ್ತಾ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಟಿ ಲೇಬರ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಯೂನಿಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಮೂಲಕ ಸೆಲ್ಫ್ ಸಫಿಷಿಯೆಂಟ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಏನು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದು ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರೆಸಿವ್ ಮೆಷರ್ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದಕರ.

ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಯಾರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಅನುಕೂಲಸ್ಥರೋ, ಯಾರು ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲರೋ ಅವರು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಂತು ಜಯಶಾಲಿಗಳಾಗಬಲ್ಲರು, ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್)

ವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವ ಕೋಮುಗಳವರಿಗೆ, ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ಪಂಗಡ ಗಳವರಿಗೆ, ಅಲ್ಪಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ಅವರು ನಿಲ್ಲುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಆಗ "ನೀವು ಬನ್ನಿ, ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. "Why should we not take his knowledge for development measures?" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—Is Sri. Mariappa prepared to go to the Taluk Board?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—If I am asked, I will go. ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ನಾಳೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಬಹುದು. ಬನ್ನಿ ಎಂದು ಜನರು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದಲೇ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪನವರನ್ನು ವೇರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. Was that a retrograde step; was it undemocratic?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It was not open to election. That is why they were nominated.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—20ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲು ಭಾಗ 'Not open to election' ಎಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಬಾಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಪೇನಲ್ ಆಫ್ ಛೇರ್‌ಮೆನ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ಕೆಲವಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

5-30 P.M.

ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾರಿದ್ದರೆಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಸಲ 'ಏನು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ತಿನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಳು ಇಲ್ಲ' ಎಂದರೆ ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಹಾಶಯ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು 'Grains are not grown on the cement roads of Bangalore' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರಾಗಿ ಯಾರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಅಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಇತರ ಎಲ್ಲ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. Why don't you ask that every Minister should be elected? ಏಕೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ? ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ ಕೋಮುಗಳವರಿಗೂ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತಾಗಲು ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. Weaker sections ಎಂದು ಇವೆ. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಚಯ್ಯನವರು ತಂದಿದ್ದಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. Weaker section economically, socially and educationally backward section ಯಾವುವಿವೆ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿರಿ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. Should they not become politically conscious? Should they not have a share in the administration of the village?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Seats can be reserved for them.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಅದಾಗಬಹುದು. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕನೊಬ್ಬನು ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ. Sri Bheemappa Naik may be a well to do man or a popular man. But his community is not so. ಅವರ ಗತಿ ಏನು? ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು? ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ, in the name of democracy you want to rule as bureaucrats! ಇಂಥಿಂಥ ಕೋಮುಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರುಗಳೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. We have no objection. You can do that. ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮೀಸಲಿಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಹೆಂಗಸರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? What is it you have done for ladies? ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. Why should you not think of reserving some seats for them? For every 20 seats at least five, if not ten, should be reserved for ladies. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾದಿರಿಸಿರಿ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಲ್ಲುವವರಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಲಿ, ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ. ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸಹೋದರಿಯರು ಇತರ ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಎಲ್ಲ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರಿಗೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಿಜರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಬರುವುದಾದರೂ ಹೇಗೆ? ನಾಮಕರಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಅಲ್ಪ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ ಕೋಮಿನವರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ provision ಇರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಿರುವಾಗ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ (ಗುಂಡ್ಲುಪೇಟೆ).—ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಇವರು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ seats ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ seats ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವವರು ನಾವೇ. ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೂ ಇದ್ದೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಜನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಒಬ್ಬರು ಉಪ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇವರಿಗೆ ರಿಜರ್ವೇಷನ್ ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ, ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್‌ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಸೇಕಡ 20 ರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸಗಳ ನಂತರ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ, Weaker section ಎನ್ನುವವರು. ಹಿಂದುಳಿದವರು, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ನೈತಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾದಿರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಜನರಿಗೆ political conciousness ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಕುರ್ಚಿಯಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವ ನೆಲದಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇವರೆಲ್ಲ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ nomination provision ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ Co-ordinating body ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದದ್ದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ *ex-officio* capacityಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟರುಗಳು, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನ ಏಳಿಗೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನ ಮಂಡಲದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ relief ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. *ex-officio* capacityಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ, ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆಯಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಏನು, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸರಿಸಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಾಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಜನರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ನನ್ನ ಅಡಿಯಾಳುಗಳು, ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಹೇಳಿದರಂತೆ. I am the head of my department in the district ಎಂದು ಎಗ್ಸಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರು, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಆಫೀಸರು ಮುಂತಾದವರು ಹೇಳಿದರಂತೆ, ಹೀಗಾದರೆ superiority complex, inferiority complex ಬೆಳೆದು ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿರುವಾಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬೇರೆ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಏಕೆ? ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಒಬ್ಬ ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಚುನಾಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. 100 per cent land revenue, 100 per cent land revenue, 100 per cent land revenue—ಮೂರು ಸಲ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ—ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Sir, before you call upon any member to speak, may I submit that it may not be possible for the next speaker to finish his speech before Six O'Clock and so I request that the House may be adjourned now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Is it the wish of the House that we should rise earlier today?

(*Several Members said 'Yes'*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—It is the wish of the House that we should rise earlier. Therefore, the House will now rise and re-assemble tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Forty-five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet at One of the Clock on Wednesday, the 7th May 1958.